

From: **Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)**
Sent: Sunday, May 14, 2017 10:07 AM
To: Shea, Valois
Subject: Permits

Dear Ms. Shea:

I would like to add some last minute observations regarding an EPA's decision about water safety in the Dewey/Burdock mining area.

Comments by those few people who expressed their support of the mining and disposal permits require enlightenment. Comments about the need for uranium for our own energy matrix are incorrect based on the reality that the US has 200 years of U308 on hand for any of its uses and needs none now or in the foreseeable future. Also, Germany, leading the way, has changed to alternative energy sources for 100% of its energy and will no longer need nuclear fuel, and California is closing its nuclear power plants, and the Fukushima radiation is traveling north to the coast of Russia, the Aleutians, south along coastal British Columbia and on down to California and Baja . All this and more it painfully obvious that the U308 from this endeavor is a failed endeavor. With the possible exception of the interest that China may have in using nuclear power for the short term while it changes over to solar and wind and water, there is no market for the yellow cake in the US and elsewhere. The price of yellow cake is so low as to preclude any profit from being made. It costs about \$65 per pound to produce, but the market is paying no more than about \$25 per pound. In addition, Power/Tech stock is now, and has been for several years, a penny stock meaning that investors know of the lack of viability of this company. Existing investors have seen their investment drop precipitously. One can easily see that there is no market and no money. Reason enough to deny the final permits.

There was mention of the NRC not finding any reason to deny the mining, meaning that the operation will be safe and non-polluting. This is true depending on how one defines "safe". The NRC, and states where In Situ mining is active or ended, have received complaints by the mining companies that they cannot meet the clean up requirements set by the NRC and the states and asking these entities to lower the required standards of clean up, which those entities have allowed. Power/Tech along with the State of South Dakota, the NRC and the EPA know that the clean up of the radioactive waste created by this mining is impossible and therefore has no intention of trying to do any clean up beyond getting the toxins "As Low As Reasonably Achievable, or ALARA. With this level of cleanup, the NRC can dismiss the danger of not being able to clean up the poisons and declare that the operation meets all requirements. It is common knowledge that there has been no ISL return to baseline by any mining companies. Each one has been and is being contaminated. One can see that there is no safe level of contamination. Reason enough to deny the final permits beyond repair.

There are four main aquifers in the southern Hills and all of them are at risk of contamination by radioactive nuclides. This will come in the form of deep injection wells and transmissivity of the waters in the aquifers. PowerTech denies any risk of contamination despite the reality of all other ISL mining operations. The EPA has been denied access to the mining area which precludes being able to actually inspect the site which precludes EPA's actual approval for obvious reasons. PowerTech has refused to reveal the constituents of the Lixivient or the actual cleaning process of the Lixivient. The EPA cannot possibly approve this mining and water contamination because of EPA ignorance of PowerTech operation. This is more than enough reason to deny the final permits.

The proponents suggest that the opposers lack intelligence, lack scientific standing and approach this issues with an over abundance of emotion. This is misdirection at it's best. Professor Stone of the SDSM &T is a scientist and teacher of impeccable credentials has studied this area extensively is quite clear as to the possible dangers of this mining operation. Professor LaGarry from Chadron State College has studied this area as well and has the same conclusions. Ms. Linsey McLean is a highly qualified chemist who has testified before you and her background, studies and knowlege of chemistry and chemical effects of mining Uranium is an expert witness and is well known in many areas of the country. These scientists are not on a payroll and answer only to scientific truth rather than a paycheck or a promise of future gains. PowrTech representatives on the other hand, have little to no experience in ISL mining, have used intimidation techniques and physical threats to browbeat mining opponents. They have continuously erred in filing the permit applications due to their ignorance of the mining process and have had to be hand led through the process. I don't blame the Lakota for being emotional, however, because their water from the Cheyenne River and their wells is already contaminated as are the Beaver Creek, Pass Creek, the Wild Horse Sanctuary and Angostora Reservoir. Because of all of this and the danger of the contamination of Igloo, (Sarin gas and high levels of radiation in the whole are,) the EPA should seek a status of SUPERFUND rather than authorize additional mining on top of the existing poisons. Please remember that the EPA 's reason for existence is to protect the environment not serve the interests of a corporation whose purpose is to violate uour protection. These are major reasons to deny these permits.

It is my understanding that monies for the NRC budget and the EPA budget are derived from the very operations that they are supposed to oversee which supports the idea that the EPA and NRC actually work for the mining companies and not the public. I noticed at the recent hearings that the EPA provided handouts explaining the ISL process but had little to say about the dangers, the leaks, the incursions or the contamination of aquifers. Your presentations represented only half the truth. Yet another reason to deny thes permits.

I want to thank you for your efforts in presenting these venues for public input. I leave you with a question. Would you want to allow known contamination into your water supply?

Sincerely yours,

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)